

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application.

Claims 1-8, 18, 19 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claim 1 recites, “the mobile magnetic portion (20) includes a magnet-based part (200) with reduced magnet weight, this part (200) having an overall volume in which the reduced magnet weight occurs...” Claim 29 recites, “a mobile magnetic portion including a magnet-based part with reduced magnet weight, the reduced magnet weight magnet-based part having an overall volume in which the reduced magnet weight occurs...” The claims have been amended to clarify that the reduced magnet weight occurs within the overall volume. Example methods of reducing magnet weight within the overall volume include a through hole recess in the magnet-based part and a recess filled with low-density material. In view of the current amendment, applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Appln. No. 10/562,748
Amendment dated September 4, 2009
Reply to Office Action dated April 29, 2009

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. BRV-39291.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: 
Brad C. Spencer – Reg. No. 57,076

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: September 4, 2009